Case: 1:22-cv-00125 Document #: 755-13 Filed: 12/16/24 Page 1 of 42 PageID #:19255 **PUBLIC VERSION**

EXHIBIT 11

In the Matter Of:

CORZO V. BROWN UNIVERSITY

1:22-cv-00125

ELIZABETH MORA

October 29, 2024



800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

1 Α. Yes. 2 Paragraph 2 lists a number of topics that Ο. 3 you were asked to address. Is that a complete and 4 exhaustive list of the topics that plaintiffs' counsel asked you to consider? 5 6 Α. Yes. 7 Okay. Were you asked at any point to 0. 8 offer your views or provide any analysis regarding 9 whether defendants have as a purpose or a primary 10 purpose to maximize revenues? 11 Α. I was. Where does that fall in this list 12 0. Okay. 13 of topics that you were asked to address? It's not on here because I did not agree 14 Α. 15 with the idea that maximizing revenue was a goal. 16 Okay. What do you understand maximizing 17 revenue to mean in the context of the university? 18 Α. So, to me, maximizing revenue, I think of 19 more broadly as maximizing endowment growth, 20 because the endowment is the fuel for everything, 21 and if one has a large endowment with hefty 22 returns, that's the engine for everything else. So

it's not revenue, it's capital for investment into



many other things -- many things.

23

24

1	or after 2008; is that correct?
2	A. That's correct.
3	Q. So you've never worked in any other
4	institution of higher education other than Harvard?
5	A. In my consulting practice, I was on
6	several engagements at higher education
7	institutions, sometimes for more than a year, but I
8	was not employed by them as an employee.
9	Q. And when you refer to your consulting
10	practice, you mean your time working as an
11	accountant or auditor?
12	A. No. This was after that.
13	If we go to Appendix B on page 38, this
14	was a representation of my client list in the
15	regulatory consulting practice.
16	Q. Okay. And in what years did you have that
17	regulatory consulting practice?
18	A. '91 to '97.
19	Q. Okay. What were the sorts of things that
20	you were consulting on in that six year period?
21	A. So training of faculty around research
22	practices. We were I was the arbitrator between
23	the government and the university on issues of
24	indirect cost reimbursement, compliance, a term



1	something that the NIH and federal grants require
2	called effort reporting, which people didn't
3	understand.
4	It was during this period of years
5	President Clinton doubled the NIH budget, so many
6	of these schools on this list went from very little
7	to quite a bit of research dollars and did not have
8	the infrastructure to support the compliance
9	required.
10	So we were hired by boards of trustees,
11	regents, presidents, provosts to come in and do
12	full scale setup of animal facilities, human
13	subject committees, training manuals, teaching
14	faculty, really anything having to do with research
15	administration, but also budgeting, as research was
16	becoming a larger part of the budget, not only in
17	the form of direct costs but in an indirect cost
18	perspective.
19	Q. So the consulting work that you did
20	between 1991 and 1997 did not have any relationship
21	to or involvement with undergraduate financial aid;
22	is that accurate?
23	A. It's accurate in that the consulting work
24	was not specific to financial aid, but in the



1	course of looking at budgets and expenditures for
2	many of these universities, financial aid was a
3	component, as was endowment income.
4	Q. What do you mean by financial aid was a
5	component of your consulting work?
6	A. Component of the budget, of the
7	university's budget writ large, so it was a line
8	item that was discussed and
9	Q. So you saw sorry.
10	A analyzed in the context of other
11	expenditures.
12	Q. Okay. So you would see financial aid as a
13	budget line item, but you were not, in substance,
14	consulting or advising on anything about financial
15	aid; is that fair?
16	MR. CIPOLLA: I can't hear you, Sarah,
17	although you're coming in clearly and I see the
18	transcript moving.
19	MS. KIRKPATRICK: Let's go off the record.
20	THE WITNESS: We were not able to hear
21	your question.
22	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: You want to go off the
23	record?
24	MS. KIRKPATRICK: Just for a moment, yeah.



Going off video record 1 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: 2 at 10:27 a.m. Eastern time. 3 (Proceedings interrupted at 10:27 a.m. and 4 reconvened at 10:30 a.m.) THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on video 5 record at 10:30 a.m. Eastern time. 6 7 BY MS. KIRKPATRICK: 8 All right. Ms. Mora, I was asking you 9 before the brief break whether it's fair to say 10 that in the course of your accounting and 11 consulting role, you saw financial aid as a line 12 item included in various university budgets, but 13 you had no responsibility for financial aid 14 administration, policy, procedure or the like. 15 Α. That is correct. Okay. And your consulting work, while you 16 0. 17 worked at an accounting firm, was not -- you were 18 never employed at any actual university other than 19 Harvard; is that correct? 20 Α. Correct. 21 Your time at Harvard started with five 0. 22 years in research administration, correct? 23 Α. Yes. 24 And the research administration role



1	sounds like it flowed directly from your accounting
2	and consulting practice in terms of grants and
3	contracts for research and the administration
4	compliance accounting for those; is that a fair
5	description?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. None of your work in research
8	administration at Harvard involved direct
9	involvement with undergraduate student financial
10	aid, correct?
11	A. Correct.
12	Q. Did you have any involvement with
13	management of Harvard's endowment during your time
14	in the research administration role?
15	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
16	A. So I got to know the endowment CEO, as I
17	was part of the chief financial officer's
18	roundtable, and he would come and make
19	presentations about the endowment performance and
20	the investment strategy to her staff and the
21	financial deans of the schools from time to time.
22	Q. When did you become a part of the chief
23	financial officer's roundtable?
24	A. From the day I started.



1	chief financial officer and then chief financial
2	officer between 2006 and 2008; is that correct?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. What was the nature or extent of your
5	involvement with undergraduate financial aid during
6	that two year period when you were CFO?
7	A. Did you say I'm sorry other graduate
8	financial aid?
9	Q. Undergraduate.
10	A. Oh, undergraduate.
11	There was no involvement with
12	undergraduate financial aid.
13	Q. So you were not involved in any
14	formulation of needs analysis methodologies; is
15	that correct?
16	A. Correct.
17	Q. You were not involved in packaging
18	financial aid awards?
19	A. No.
20	Q. You were not
21	A. That all happened at Harvard College.
22	Q. So you had no role in undergraduate
23	financial aid at any point during your tenure at
24	Harvard?



1	A. I did not have any role in undergraduate
2	financial aid.
3	Q. And fair to say, I assume then, that you
4	have had no role in undergraduate financial aid at
5	any other university since you have not worked at
6	any other university other than Harvard?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. You've never been involved in developing
9	or implementing need analysis methodologies for any
10	university, correct?
11	A. No, I have not.
12	Q. You've not been involved in determining
13	what should comprise a financial aid package for
14	any undergraduate students of any university?
15	A. No, I have not.
16	Q. You've never participated in forums or
17	industry groups focused on financial aid policy or
18	procedure?
19	A. No, I have not.
20	Q. Your report, your opening report at
21	paragraph 16, which appears on page 8, under the
22	heading Higher Education Industry Experience
23	A. Yes.
24	Q refers to the familiarity to you



1	So people who were working on index cards
2	could not support a 33-digit chart of account
3	enterprise reporting system. So there was a lot of
4	turnover, and there was an effort to recruit people
5	from outside the university. And as part of my
6	recruitment and others recruitment, it was
7	considered good practice to share what we were
8	doing with others.
9	Q. You say in paragraph 16 that you gained
10	knowledge about other universities' operations
11	through your participation in various forums. Did
12	you also learn about other university operations
13	through the four or five professional the
14	national professional organizations that you've
15	referred to?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Okay. And did you also have conversations
18	with peers or counterparts from other universities
19	outside the context of those two groups of sort of
20	formal industry gatherings, or were your
21	conversations in the context of those different
22	groups and forums?
23	A. I'm not sure I understand the question.
24	Q. So you described meetings and seminars of



1	the four or five national professional
2	organizations on the one hand that you do not list
3	here and then the three narrower forums that you do
4	list in paragraph 17.
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And I'm trying to understand whether the
7	conversations you had with your counterparts from
8	other universities were confined to the formal
9	activities of those two sets of groups or whether
10	you also had ad hoc separate conversations that
11	form part of the knowledge and familiarity that
12	you're describing in paragraph 16?
13	A. Oh, there were many ad hoc conversations.
14	I would pick up the phone, someone would pick up
15	the phone, I would go to San Francisco for personal
16	reasons and spend an afternoon at Stanford with my
17	counterparts there as one example.
18	I became friendly with the people at
19	CalTech, hence the consulting arrangement. So when
20	I would go to LA for other reasons, I would, you
21	know, have dinner with my counterpart at CalTech.
22	Q. Okay. Are there other schools that you
23	had conversations with your counterparts or peers
24	other than Stanford and CalTech that formed part of



1	this familiarity and knowledge that you're
2	describing in paragraph 16?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Can you identify the other schools that
5	you spoke with?
6	A. Yes. My boss at Harvard had left Harvard
7	and went to Brown as executive vice president, and
8	I would be in frequent communication with her. The
9	woman who was the executive dean for administration
10	at Harvard Medical School went to Yale, and I
11	frequently spoke to her. I had an employee who
12	another employee who went to Johns Hopkins, and I
13	would speak to him frequently.
14	I mentioned CalTech. So I had a lot of
15	interaction with MIT around the formation of the
16	Broad Institute, so I was with those folks several
17	times a week for a period of two years. So yes,
18	so, you know, frequent conversations, Brown, Yale,
19	Hopkins, CalTech, MIT, Stanford.
20	Q. And that list of schools, there are it
21	appears that there are at least a number of the
22	defendant schools in this litigation that you have
23	not identified.
24	Are there schools in this litigation with



1	whom you did not have personal relationships or
2	regularly engage in conversations about how they
3	operated?
4	MR. CIPOLLA: Object to form.
5	A. So let me look at the list again.
6	As I said, I interviewed the fellow who
7	ran the endowment at Notre Dame. I did a project
8	at Northwestern. I didn't know anybody at
9	Georgetown. My people who went to Johns Hopkins
10	then went to Duke, and they're at Duke now. I met,
11	through the woman at Brown who was my former boss,
12	the fellow who became the president of the
13	University of Chicago, he was a provost at Brown,
14	and I had dinner with her and him a couple of
15	times.
16	I don't think there was any interaction
17	with anybody at Penn, and there was not interaction
18	with anybody at Rice or Vanderbilt.
19	Q. You've mentioned twice that you
20	interviewed a man who ran the endowment at Notre
21	Dame. Did you have any other source of contact in
22	terms of understanding Notre Dame's university
23	operations more generally or is that limited to
24	interviewing the head of the endowment?



1	A. It was
2	MR. CIPOLLA: Object to form.
3	A. It was limited to him, because they
4	didn't they weren't in these other groups. They
5	may have been at some of these other meetings that
6	I just mentioned, NCUBO, but, you know, they were
7	not I don't know why, but they were not they
8	were sort of on the margin, if you will. They
9	didn't send representatives to the leaders in some
10	of the organizations that I mentioned during the
11	time that I was at Harvard.
12	Q. Were the schools with whom you did have
13	some connections or personal relationships that you
14	used to gain familiarity with how other
15	universities operated, are you relying for your
16	opinions in this case on any specific conversations
17	that you had in the course of your time at Harvard?
18	A. No, not specific conversations, but rather
19	the accumulation of many conversations, workshops,
20	symposium, presentations, discussions. As you
21	Q. Did you
22	A. Sorry.
23	Q. Go ahead.
24	A. The woman who was my close colleague in



1	the faculty of arts and sciences at Harvard went to
2	become CFO of Dartmouth, and I'm friendly with her
3	today. She's left, but she was there for a number
4	of years.
5	Q. Okay.
6	MR. CIPOLLA: Are we reaching a natural
7	stopping point? It's been almost
8	MS. KIRKPATRICK: I was just going to say,
9	I think this is a good point to take a break, so
10	let's go off the record.
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. We're going off
12	video record at 10:58 a.m. Eastern time.
13	(Proceedings interrupted at 10:58 a.m. and
14	reconvened at 11:11 a.m.)
15	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on video
16	record at 11:11 a.m. Eastern time.
17	BY MS. KIRKPATRICK:
18	Q. All right. Ms. Mora, at paragraph 18 of
19	your opening report, you refer in the first
20	sentence to efforts that you made to understand the
21	various secondary source rankings of educational
22	institutions to compare where we stood in those
23	rankings compared to other universities.
24	Do you see that?



1	A. No.
2	Q. Have you performed any research on the
3	economics of higher education?
4	A. No.
5	Q. Do you have any academic degrees or study
6	or educational credentials regarding financial aid,
7	undergraduate financial aid?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Any publications, scholarly literature,
10	other research that you've conducted on
11	undergraduate financial aid?
12	A. No.
13	Q. Any professional experience that you have
14	working with or in the field of undergraduate
15	financial aid?
16	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
17	A. No.
18	Q. Do you have any academic degrees, study,
19	or other educational credentials regarding the
20	characteristics of non-profit organizations?
21	A. I have taken a course in non-profit
22	accounting, but that's not a degree.
23	Q. Okay. When was that course?
24	A. Late '80s.



1	Q. Is that the extent of your academic study
2	regarding the characteristics of non-profit
3	organizations?
4	A. So I just I want to make sure I
5	understand the question. So these professional
6	organizations that I'm describing, that I described
7	to you before we broke, there were many seminars
8	offered on the characteristics of colleges versus
9	universities, decentralized institutions,
10	centralized institutions, state universities,
11	community college. So there were a cadre of
12	courses that I would seminars that I would
13	attend, but without a degree. So I immersed myself
14	in the teaching and knowledge gathering around
15	higher education writ large, but without a degree
16	program per se.
17	Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that you've not
18	undertaken any academic study and you don't have
19	any educational credentials regarding non-profit
20	organizations more broadly, so not focused here on
21	higher education, but non-profits as a broader
22	category of organization?
23	A. That's fair to say.
24	Q. Okay. And what you described as your



1 governance course and one of the topics addressed 2 by that course was the difference between 3 non-profits and for-profits? 4 Α. Yes. Have you yourself conducted any academic 5 0. 6 study or analysis regarding the differences between 7 for-profits and non-profit organizations? 8 Α. No. 9 0. Have you authored any publications or 10 scholarly literature about the differences between for-profit and non-profit organizations? 11 12 I've given talks about the difference, but 13 I haven't written a publication. 14 To whom have you given talks about that? Ο. 15 There's an organization called The Boston Α. 16 Club and it's a professional women's organization 17 in Boston, and they put on workshops throughout the 18 vear. And there's a subgroup within that 19 organization on governance, and I have been 20 asked -- I was asked, let's see, before the 21 pandemic, 2017, something like that, to give a talk 22 on having worked in not-for-profit and having 23 served on a number of corporate boards, if I could 24 talk about the differences in governance aspects



1	opinion that although they are non-profits, legally
2	and, I don't know, functionally, you observe
3	certain operational similarities between Harvard
4	and the defendants on the one hand and some
5	category of for profit companies that you describe
6	as diversified conglomerate businesses; is that
7	correct?
8	A. That's correct.
9	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
10	Q. Okay. Is it fair to say that you also
11	observe, although you don't discuss it in your
12	opening report, certain operational differences
13	between Harvard and the defendants on the one hand
14	and at least some diversified conglomerate
15	for-profit businesses on the other hand?
16	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
17	A. Operational differences, yes.
18	Q. So there are some operational similarities
19	and some operational differences?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. And you have in your opening report
22	focused on seven what you observe to be operational
23	similarities between universities and diversified
24	conglomerate businesses, right?



1	A. What page are you on?
2	Q. Still on paragraph 20. We haven't made
3	very much progress yet.
4	A. When you say seven
5	Q. Well, proceed from paragraphs 21 through
6	31, seven features.
7	A. Oh, I see. Yes. Yes.
8	Q. How did you select the seven features that
9	you chose to talk about in section V of your
10	report?
11	A. They seem to me to be the most obvious,
12	those that really when I put some thought into
13	the way the university ran and my knowledge of how
14	the group under discussion here runs, these were
15	prominent examples of ways that the institutions
16	mirrored public company operations and governance.
17	Q. Would you agree that each of these seven
18	features are sort of a spectrum on which any one
19	entity sort of could be more or less like any other
20	entity but not not sort of objective yes/no
21	features?
22	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
23	A. Are each of these seven I want to make
24	sure I understand your question. Are each of these



1 seven examples scalable in terms of varying in 2 degree? Yes. 3 And therefore would you agree that each of 4 the individual 17 defendants might be more or 5 less -- might have these features in greater or 6 lesser degrees? 7 Α. Yes. They're different, but they are --8 while they may not have exactly these seven, they 9 may have others that are not shown here. So they may have other similarities in 10 0. 11 terms of operations that you've not discussed. 12 Α. Yes. 13 Correct? Yes? 0. 14 Α. Yes. 15 And they also have certain operational differences that you have also not discussed, 16 17 correct? 18 Α. Yes. 19 Is it fair to say that the opinion Okav. 20 you've offered here about certain similarities, 21 certain operational similarities between defendants 22 and what you describe as diversified conglomerate 23 businesses, that observation of similarities would 24 also apply to at least some other universities



1	beyond the 17 defendants?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Can you think of any universities outside
4	of the 17 defendants who would similarly share some
5	of these operational similarities?
6	A. Yes. The University of California system,
7	for example.
8	Q. The UC system?
9	A. Yeah.
10	Q. Okay. Any others?
11	A. University of Michigan, University of
12	North Carolina, the New York state university
13	system, UMass system.
14	Let me look at my list of my clients.
15	Georgia Tech, Northeastern has become a huge
16	business, UAB, University of Alabama, Minnesota is
17	huge and complicated. Those are examples.
18	Q. Okay. I take it from your answer that
19	you're not offering an opinion that there's
20	anything about the membership in the 568 group per
21	se that corresponds to this observation you've made
22	about certain operational similarities between
23	universities and for-profit businesses; is that
24	right?
l	



1	with complex business operations as those that are
2	akin to for-profit businesses in some respects.
3	Q. And you also view, sounds like, a large
4	number of public universities as having complex
5	business operations that are akin to for-profit
6	businesses in certain respects as well.
7	A. In certain respects, yes.
8	Q. And I take it in addition, you are not
9	suggesting or tell me if I'm wrong about this
10	I believe you're not suggesting that there's some
11	dividing line at the U.S. News & World Report top
12	25 such that the 26th ranked school does not have
13	operational similarities to for-profit businesses,
14	where the 25th ranked school does have those
15	similarities, correct?
16	A. Correct. I'm not saying that.
17	Q. Okay. So there are other private
18	universities that are not necessarily in the top 25
19	of the U.S. News & World Report rankings about whom
20	these operations of operational similarities would
21	also apply, correct?
22	A. Correct.
23	MR. CIPOLLA: We've been going for more
24	than an hour and it's getting close to lunch. I



1 for-profit public companies other than the seven 2 that you discuss in your opening report? 3 Α. Let's see. I'm sure I could think of 4 These are those that really popped out to 5 me as exemplary of ways that Harvard and the other 6 defendants have elements that reminded me very much 7 of the way that corporations operate. I'm sure I 8 could think of others if I had to. 9 MS. KIRKPATRICK: Okay. Let's take a 10 break there and go off the record. THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. Going off video 11 12 record at 12:28 p.m. Eastern time. 13 (Proceedings interrupted at 12:28 p.m. and 14 reconvened at 1:21 p.m.) 15 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on video 16 record at 1:21 p.m. Eastern time. 17 BY MS. KIRKPATRICK: 18 All right. Good afternoon, Ms. Mora. 0. 19 I asked you before lunch about the seven 20 features that we're going to talk about now that 21 you go through in section V of your report, and I 22 asked you how you selected those seven features. 23 And I believe that you said that those were the 24 ones that struck you as the most obvious.



1	Can you point me to any published
2	literature or research or study or analysis that
3	you reviewed for purposes of forming your opinions
4	in this case that relies on these same seven
5	features or characteristics in order to describe or
6	indicate that a given company is a for-profit
7	public company?
8	A. No.
9	Q. Any literature or study or analysis that
10	you can point to that suggests that these
11	particular seven features are indicative of
12	operations similar to a for-profit public company?
13	A. If we were to look at the annual report of
14	a public company or the proxy statement, there are
15	elements of these characteristics that would be
16	featured in the report and to the proxy statement,
17	such as number of employees, business unit
18	diversification, description of how the business
19	operated, those entities within the business that
20	were most profitable and those that were not, or
21	that were least profitable, governance structure.
22	Q. Okay. So if I'm understanding you
23	correctly, you're saying these seven features would
24	be to some degree described or reported on in a



one or more defendants should have allocated more 1 2 of the five revenue sources that you just 3 identified to undergraduate financial aid? 4 Α. I'm not offering that opinion. 5 0. So you are observing that there are six sources of revenue, of which five entail 6 7 flexibility that includes the ability to allocate 8 to financial aid, correct? 9 Α. Right. And you go through in this section 10 0. Okay. 11 of your report and talk about each of these six 12 sources of revenue based on your experience at 13 For purposes of this report, did you Harvard. 14 undertake any systematic analysis, research, where 15 you have data to assess the six forms of revenue 16 and their availability to the 17 defendants? 17 Α. I did not undertake an analysis for the 17 18 defendants, no. But I did read, for example, as 19 one example, about the University of Pennsylvania 20 earning close to \$1 billion in royalties from the 21 development of the RNA vaccine, technology that 22 Moderna and Pfizer used to create the COVID-19 23 And Northwestern had a similar vaccine. 24 blockbuster in the Lyrica drug.



1	So I did not undertake a systematic
2	analysis, but I saw data points, if you will,
3	within categories of revenue that, coupled with my
4	knowledge of the defendants, in particular Brown,
5	CalTech, Cornell, Dartmouth, MIT, and Penn and
6	Yale, that led me to believe that each of those
7	also have flexibility with each of those has
8	these six sources, five of which have inherent
9	flexibility to increase a contribution to financial
10	aid.
11	Q. Okay. Would you agree that the relative
12	size of these six different revenue sources varies
13	from school to school?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. So some of the defendant schools may earn
16	sizable revenues from its, for example,
17	intellectual property royalties, where other
18	schools in this group may not earn very much from
19	that category?
20	A. I agree with that.
21	Q. The same would be true, for example, of
22	athletic revenues, correct?
23	A. I agree with that.
24	Q. One might not expect to see substantial



1	financial flexibility flowing from athletic
2	revenues at CalTech or MIT?
3	A. I knew you were going to say that. Yes.
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MS. KIRKPATRICK: Okay. Some of these
6	schools are not exactly in our athletic league.
7	Q. Okay. You did not undertake, I gather,
8	any overall or systematic quantification of the six
9	different categories of revenue of the 17 different
10	defendants, correct?
11	A. I did not.
12	Q. Putting aside the grants and contracts
13	category, which you've already agreed does not
14	entail the same degree of flexibility, is it your
15	view that other five categories are all equally
16	flexible in terms of discretionary spending or are
17	there differences between the flexibility that
18	flows from the other five categories of revenue?
19	A. So let's go one by one. Tuition is
20	unrestricted, it can be used to subsidize financial
21	aid. Distributions from the endowment, to me, is
22	the most powerful engine of all the revenue
23	categories.
24	When I say grant and contract revenue,



1 what I mean is direct costs of grant and contract 2 The indirect cost rate applied to grants revenue. 3 and contracts comes back to the university as 4 unrestricted, so it could be used. 5 indirect cost is a percentage of their direct cost. 6 When I was there, it was 68 percent. 7 To the extent that annual donations are 8 directed toward financial aid or unrestricted, yes, 9 they can be used, athletic revenue could be used, and IP could be used after the investigator --10 11 usually there's a formula, the investigator gets a 12 percentage, the school gets a percentage, the dean 13 gets a percentage, and the legal fees are paid, and 14 then the rest is unrestricted. 15 It sounds to me like the answer to 16 my question is the different categories of revenue 17 identified here have different degrees of 18 flexibility or restriction. 19 Α. Yes. 20 And given that you have not undertaken any 21 quantification or analysis of the six categories of revenue and the 17 defendants, I take it that you 22 23 also have not undertaken to quantify the exact amounts of revenue and the percentages of those 24



	CONZO V. BROWN CHIVEROIT
1	revenues that may be flexible or inflexible,
2	restricted or unrestricted on the 17 defendants,
3	correct?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. During your couple of years as the CFO at
6	Harvard, was one of your goals to achieve a
7	balanced budget for the university?
8	A. Goal, yes.
9	Q. Okay. And what did you how would you
10	define a balanced budget in that context?
11	A. Having a I would define a balanced
12	budget as having a slightly positive net asset
13	surplus.
14	Q. When you say "slightly positive," what do
15	you mean by that?
16	A. More than zero.
17	Q. So you were looking to have at least one
18	more dollar in revenues coming in than the range of
19	costs and obligations and expenditures you had
20	going out?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. You described that goal at paragraph 57 of

your report where you say, "At Harvard, we made it

one of our goals to be able to report on our public



23

24

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- funds can only be spent in support of fund's
 designated purpose."
 - A. Yes. I see that.
 - Q. So your recollection is inconsistent with this, in that your recollection is that half of the restricted endowment funds did not have restrictions on the payout or the income?

MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.

- A. Yes. My recollection is that while I was there, half of the restricted funds did not have stipulations with respect to restricting the income from the endowment.
- Q. Did you review any information or materials about the 17 defendant universities in terms of the percentage of their restricted endowment that was associated with unrestricted income?
- A. No.
- Q. So I take it that you are not offering any opinion that the percentage that you recall from your time at Harvard accurately corresponds to any other defendant universities' endowment flexibility in terms of income coming from restricted endowment funds?



1	corresponded to its restricted endowment or that it
2	had flexibility as to some portion of its
3	restricted endowment principal and income?
4	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
5	A. As I said in my report, some of the
6	restricted endowment income was unrestricted.
7	Q. And during your tenure at Harvard, the
8	proportion of endowment principal that was
9	restricted was what?
10	A. 85 percent.
11	Q. 85 percent.
12	And you have not evaluated how that
13	85 percent corresponds or doesn't correspond to the
14	percentage of restrictions applicable to any of the
15	defendants' endowments, correct?
16	A. I have not.
17	Q. So some of them may have a higher
18	percentage of restricted funds, some them may have
19	a lower percentage of restricted funds?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Have you looked at any individual
22	endowment funds or restrictions at any of the other
23	any of the defendant schools in order to
24	evaluate the terms or look at how they're



structured or anything along those lines?

- A. I have not.
- Q. And you're not offering any opinion on the degree of flexibility that any of the 17 defendants had for any particular proportion of their endowment principal or endowment income, correct?
 - A. No, I'm not offering any opinion on that.
- Q. In paragraph 50 you refer to the unrestricted endowment funds, and you say that at Harvard you regarded unrestricted endowment funds as a source of working capital for the university as a whole and for special projects. And then you go on to say that it's your understanding that that was also true of the defendants.

Is that understanding based on anything other than the general conversations you have described with representatives of some subset of the defendants?

- A. It is not based on anything other than those conversations.
- Q. And, again, those were conversations that took place during your tenure at Harvard. You're not relying on conversations postdating 2008, right?



1	So I'm back in your report in paragraph
2	5.D. Are you offering an opinion that schools,
3	Harvard and other schools, offer institutional
4	financial aid solely for the purpose of maintaining
5	excellence and prestige, or are you offering the
6	opinion that providing institutional financial aid
7	has the consequence of maintaining excellence and
8	prestige?
9	A. The latter.
10	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
11	A. Financial aid was given to diversify the
12	student body, which served to create excellence and
13	prestige.
14	Q. Going back to section VII of your report.
15	After the discussion of prestige, you have a
16	section beginning at paragraph 67 on endowments.
17	Do you see that?
18	A. Yes, I do.
19	Q. And you describe defendants and their
20	peers as competing with one another over endowment
21	size and endowment growth.
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. What do you mean when you say that
24	"defendants compete with each other over endowment



|--|

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

- And the question there is the reason Ο. institutional grants for institutional financial aid are provided to students. Is that one of the questions that you were asked when you undertook this engagement?
- Α. Yes.
- Which portion or portions of your opening Ο. report addresses that question?
 - I believe section VIII, paragraph 69. Α.
- Okav. And does the remainder of section 11 Ο. 12 VIII, carrying on through paragraph 75, also have 13 some bearing, or is it your view that paragraph 69 14 is the full response to that question?
- 15 It's paragraph 69, paragraph 70 and paragraph 71, paragraph 72. 16
- 17 0. Okay. So one of the purposes then of institutional financial aid is, as you say in
- 19 paragraph 69, to enroll the most talented students;
- 20 is that right?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- And that corresponds to providing the best 22
- 23 possible education because of the peer effect and
- 24 other dynamics that we've talked about; is that



1	right?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. And what you described earlier as the role
4	of financial aid and diversifying the student body;
5	is that right?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Is the discussion that appears from
8	paragraph 69 to say 74, a sort of fulsome and
9	complete listing of all the reasons that the
10	university might provide institutional financial
11	aid?
12	A. I don't I don't imagine it's fulsome
13	and complete. I think these are rather the
14	highlights of why the university should provide
15	institutional financial aid.
16	Something that we have not talked about is
17	investing in the class so that the graduates look
18	favorably upon the institution as they enter their
19	lives and begin to find success. So they remember
20	as alumni, the investment made in them and can
21	further the investment in by way of gifts so
22	that, again, the endowment continues into
23	perpetuity.
24	Q. Yeah. And we'll turn to that investment



1	rationale in just a moment.
2	But in terms of the sort of
3	diversification, quality of education, educational
4	mission component of institutional financial aid,
5	the opinions that you're offering here are based on
6	your experience and your personal observations of
7	Harvard; is that right?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Are you basing these opinions on any other
10	research analysis, et cetera?
11	A. No.
12	Q. But you did observe during your time at
13	Harvard, participate in conversations that the
14	diversification, the enrollment of talented
15	students and the pursuit of educational mission
16	were at least contributing reasons for Harvard's
17	administration of institutional financial aid?
18	A. Yes, that's right.
19	Q. So I want to turn now to paragraph 74 and
20	the point that you just made about institutional
21	financial aid as a form of business strategy for
22	seeking future donations to the university.
23	What's the basis for that rationale for
24	financial aid?



1	A. The basis is if someone feels that they
2	have been invested in, they're more likely to give
3	back to that investment. It's a concept of, you
4	know, gratitude and loyalty.
5	Q. Have you undertaken any analysis or
6	research into the sort of cost benefit of investing
7	into student's educational experience and how that
8	corresponds to returns in the form of later
9	donations or investments by those alumni back into
10	the university?
11	A. I have not. I just have anecdotal
12	information.
13	Q. So that is an impression that you have
14	from your time at Harvard; is that fair?
15	A. That's fair.
16	Q. But you are not purporting to offer an
17	opinion that there is some economic analysis or
18	rationale underlying that?
19	A. No.
20	Q. And I take it you've not conducted any
21	analysis or study or research as to any of the
22	other schools, the 17 defendants, to assess whether
23	that rationale applies or is borne out economically
24	at those schools?



A. I have not.

- Q. Okay. Are you offering the opinion that Harvard University as an institution used this business strategy or investment return rationale as the primary rationale for institutional financial aid?
- A. No. I'm not offering that opinion that it's the primary. It's one of many factors.
- Q. Okay. So this is a rationale that you observed or you believe you observed at Harvard, but not the motivating rationale, in your view?
- A. Correct. The motivating rationale was to secure a diverse student body.
- Q. Okay. I want to go back to something we talked about right before we took the lunch break. We were discussing section V of your report, and if it helps to have it in front of you, that is the section that begins at paragraph 20 on page 10.

And we were talking about your opinion, which you clarified in your rebuttal report, is an opinion that the defendants have certain operational similarities to for-profit public companies.

Do you recall that --



1	of your departure?
2	A. Yes.
3	Q. Fair to say that your departure was
4	unplanned and unexpected?
5	MR. CIPOLLA: Objection, form.
6	A. No. It was that would not be fair to
7	say.
8	Q. Okay. Can you describe the reason for
9	your departure in spring of 2008?
10	A. I was recruited to Draper. I had an issue
11	with my background check that needed my full
12	attention to resolve.
13	Q. So you departed Harvard to go to Draper
14	because you preferred to work at Draper rather than
15	to remain the CFO of Harvard?
16	A. Yes. I was a little tired of the musical
17	chairs of presidents, and I felt Draper was more
18	stable and could afford me responsibility and
19	authority.
20	Q. So your departure had nothing to do with
21	the substantial cash losses that Harvard suffered
22	in 2008?
23	A. I left long before that.
24	Q. Did the investment strategy in which



1	Harvard's, or some significant portion of Harvard's
2	cash reserves were invested alongside its
3	endowment, was that a strategy implemented under
4	your supervision?
5	A. That was a strategy that President Larry
6	Summers insisted upon.
7	Q. Okay. And it continued while you were
8	CFO, correct?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And then at some point in 2008, that
11	resulted in what was properly described as
12	catastrophic loss for Harvard?
13	A. Yes. I wasn't there, but yes.
14	Q. When did you decide to pursue the Draper
15	Laboratories position as opposed to the Harvard CFO
16	position?
17	A. I got a call in the early spring of 2008,
18	and I had several evening meetings over there. But
19	a condition of my employment involved getting a
20	certain type of clearance, which I thought would be
21	fairly easy, but ended up not being as easy, and it
22	required my full time attention. So I had kept
23	them hanging while this was going on and I just
24	needed to resolve it.

